New York Tribune

First to Last—the Truth: News—Editorials—Advertisements

Member of the Audit Bureau of Circulations.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1917

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York Corporation. Ogden Reid, President; G. Vernor Rogers, Vice-President; F. A. Suter, Treasurer. Address, Tribune Building, 154 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone, Beekman 3000.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.—By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York:

Daily and Sunday, 1 mo.	$ .75	Daily only, 1 month	$ .55
Daily and Sunday, 6 mos.	4.25	Daily only, 6 months	3.00
Daily and Sunday, 1 year	8.50	Daily only, 1 year	6.00
Sunday only, 6 months	1.25	Sunday only, 1 year	2.50

FOREIGN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.		CANADIAN RATES. DAILY AND SUNDAY.	
One month	$1.84	One month	$ .75
One year	22.05	One year	8.50
SUNDAY ONLY.		DAILY ONLY.	
Six months	3.33	One month	.50
One year	6.66	One year	6.00
DAILY ONLY.		SUNDAY ONLY.	
One month	1.29	One month	.50
One year	15.79	One year	4.58

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

"Lafayette, Nous Voila!"

To-day at City Hall a certain number of American citizens, in the presence of representatives of the French Republic, will observe the birthday of Lafayette, which is also the anniversary of the Battle of the Marne. Again, as last year, American voices will be raised in praise and homage to France for ancient and contemporary services.

But the real American tribute to France is that which is made not in New York, but in France itself. The thousands of American soldiers already on French soil are the real expression of American sentiment and American gratitude.

Lafayette, nous voila! So an American officer spoke at the tomb of Lafayette, and the words will be memorable hereafter. America has come to France. America is on the way to the firing line which France has held for our common civilization and our common ideal of liberty for more than three years. Some day there will rise on French battlefields monuments like that at Yorktown commemorating achievements by American soldiers again fighting side by side with French soldiers.

Lafayette, nous voila! There could be no more fitting phrase to express the sentiment of the people of the United States, whose sons are now in France on Lafayette's birthday.

Another By-product of War

Our radical friends have been very fond of asserting that war is wholly destructive in its effects, that it sets back the clock and halts the march of liberal thought. Mr. Bertrand Russell in one of his later and excited moods proved to his own satisfaction that the war would soon exterminate our entire existing civilization. Perhaps it will. But while waiting for the débâcle it is interesting to note the items on the other side of the balance, items which Mr. Russell and his pacifist followers seem quite unable to note or count.

Details are now at hand, for instance, of the new education bill lately introduced in the British House of Commons. It represents the ideas of Mr. Fisher, the new Minister of Education, and being the work of a coalition Cabinet is assured of an excellent chance of passing. "The Children's Charter" is the London "Times's" phrase for the bill, which it hails as "a turning point in English history" and as working "little less than a revolution both in education and in industry.

That is strong language. Yet it certainly does not go beyond the facts or beyond the eloquent speech of Mr. Fisher in introducing the bill. Said he in reviewing the causes which led up to the proposal:

> The third feature in the movement of things is the increased feeling of social solidarity which has been created by the war. When you get conscription, when you get a state of affairs under which the poor are asked to pour out their blood and to be mulcted in the high cost of living for larger international policy, then every just mind begins to realize that the boundaries of citizenship are not determined by wealth, and that the same logic which leads us to desire an extension of the franchise points also to an extension of education. There is a growing sense not only in England but through Europe, and I may say especially in France, that the industrial workers of the country are entitled to be considered primarily as citizens and as fit subjects for any form of education by which they are capable of profiting.
>
> I notice also that a new way of thinking about education has sprung up among many of the more neglected members of our industrial army. They do not want education in order that they may become better technical workmen and earn higher wages; they do not want it in order that they may rise out of their own class. They want it because they know that in the treasures of the mind they can find an aid to good citizenship, a source of pure enjoyment and a refuge from the necessary hardships of a life spent in the midst of the clanging machinery of our hideous cities of toil. I ask whether there is a single struggling young student in this country to whom a library of good books has not made an elemental democratic appeal.

Among the more striking features of the bill which would become the common protection and aid of every child of England and Wales are nursery schools up to the age of five, the fixing of the whole-time school age at the period between six and fourteen, the total abolition of all child labor under the age of twelve, severe restrictions on wage earning between twelve and fourteen and the compulsory provision of continuation schools up to the age of eighteen.

The scope of the bill must be judged by the existing standards of education and of child industry in England. Criticism of the bill and a look beyond its obvious limitations are easy. The point we stress is the welcoming attitude of the nation toward the unprecedented advance which the bill proposes and the clear relation of that advance to the effects of the war. "Social solidarity" is Mr. Fisher's phrase. Or, from another point of view, as the London "Times" argued nearly two years ago: "If we are to face the future with confidence after this exhausting war we must face it as an educated nation. We shall not be able to afford to waste the efficiency of a single English child."

The motives for the revolution may be various. The effect is one. And generations of the children of England promise to be the profiters. The next time our pacifist friends audit the books of war they might at least enter this item in dignified silence.

Another Strategic Retreat?

The recently reported removal of the civilian populations from the war zone in Flanders is susceptible of two interpretations. It may be the result of the policy of clearing an affected area before a military operation—a step customary under present conditions—or it may be the prelude to another German operation similar to that of last spring.

The strategic retirement of the German between Arras and Noyons in March of this year had a two-fold purpose. It was in a sense, as an English writer has said, a deferred dividend of the Battle of the Somme. In other words, the British gained in March ground possession of which was assured to them by their operations of the preceding autumn. But the German retirement went beyond any necessary remaking of their front incident to British achievement in the preceding year.

Hindenburg's theory was plainly that if he succeeded in putting from ten to twenty miles of devastated country between his new front and the old British first line he would postpone indefinitely any Allied attack, because before this Allied attack could come artillery would have to be brought forward, roads would have to be built, and there would have to be an entire transformation of the transport system behind the British front. On the whole, this strategy was successful and there has been no British offensive of considerable proportions between the Arras front and St. Quentin—that is, on the front of the Germans' retreat.

It is now generally believed that Hindenburg had also contemplated a strong offensive directed against the British while they were still advancing over the devastated country and before they were in a position to meet the blow. This portion of Hindenburg's strategy—if, indeed, it was a portion of his strategy—was completely baffled by Sir Douglas Haig's great attack on the Vimy Ridge front, which began on Easter Monday. This attack pinned down Hindenburg's strategic reserves to defensive operations east of Arras and abolished all chance of a counter blow further to the south.

Looking now to the Flanders front, it is clear that the British are in the position to make a powerful thrust out from Ypres in the direction of Roulers. They have practically surmounted all the high ground from the Messines Ridge round to Pilkem, save for one little stretch about Zonnebeke. The Germans have now to choose between a defensive stand, with the ground against them, and a repetition of Hindenburg's method of last spring.

If, as is suggested in the dispatches of yesterday, the Germans are about to retire ten or twelve miles, they can, by using the intricate waterways, by destroying the bridges, by laying waste the country, build up a barrier in front of them that will take the British some weeks to surmount. There are probably not more than eight weeks more of campaigning weather in Flanders before the onset of fall rains transforms the country into a quagmire. It is plain, therefore, that if the Germans wish to avoid a costly defensive, with its inevitable casualties and expenditure of munitions, they can achieve this object by retiring a few miles to other carefully prepared lines about Roulers.

This would mean that the Germans had declined battle and retired in the face of the enemy. It would be a confession of weakness in other circumstances, but German strategy has already frankly confessed that it seeks a decision not on the battlefield, but on the blue water, and it looks for triumph not by the offensive operations of armies in France and Belgium, but by the submarine campaign elsewhere.

It is conceivable, too, that the Germans are contemplating the transfer of sufficient divisions to the Eastern front to make a considerable advance into Russia, although it is always doubtful whether they have any intention of going to Petrograd at the present time. Conceivably they may believe that the Russian conditions are so bad that a heavy blow now would produce a state of anarchy fatal to all Russian recovery for the duration of the present war. In such a case it would be good strategy, both political and military, to avoid a Western battle which held out no promise of material advantage and concentrate their effort upon a more profitable Eastern venture.

It is too early to do more than speculate upon the meaning of the current reports. Yet it is manifest what they may mean. It is also evident that the Germans have no expectation of permanently holding Northern France or Belgium. Consequently, there is every reason to suppose that they will from time to time shorten their lines whenever there is profit for them in such an operation either through the release of men for use elsewhere or through avoidance of heavy and sterile sacrifices necessary to retain ground that will ultimately have to be evacuated.

It would be idle to pretend that the occupation of the ground now under discussion would be of any large advantage to the British at the moment. If they take it by battle their gain will be in the losses inflicted upon the Germans. It has no large strategic value. It has no industrial or agricultural value, and whenever they abandon it the Germans will still have in the rear as good a line as they hold now. If the retreat comes it will probably be the final episode in the British campaign for the year. But it is not safe yet to conclude on the evidence available that such a retreat is to come.

Camp Mothers

Police Commissioner Woods could not do a better piece of war work than to appoint women police officers to patrol parks, navy yards and armories, as urged by the Mayor's Committee of Women on National Defence.

Such a measure is not unprecedented. Eighteen months ago England officially appointed camp policewomen, after women volunteers had successfully demonstrated that their services were invaluable. That immoral conditions will prevail in army camps has long been an axiom of war, but England, first by "cordially recognizing" the volunteer policewomen and then by appointing them as officers, has raised the standard of her army life an appreciable degree.

There is no question that women officers can do this special protective and preventive work better than the average policeman. Aside from any sentimental generalizations about woman as a natural protector of the race, and apart from superfeministic claims for her superiority over man in every capacity, experience has shown that in this kind of work women are more successful than men. "Camp mothers" have unlimited opportunity for good; "camp fathers" would not get very far, one fears.

The War Department last week appealed to the suffragists of New Jersey to establish recreation centres at Camp Dick, at Wrightstown, and to investigate the moral conditions of the camp. The suffragists responded by appointing a large working committee to carry on this work. The women of Texas, having learned from the experience of last summer, have undertaken the "camp mother" movement.

The Mayor's Committee of Women on National Defence has investigated for New York City and has found that conditions among the soldiers and sailors and young girls are far from ideal. They have demonstrated also that without arrest, without publicity, many cases of immorality can be prevented. New York should have their services as part of the city administration.

No Two Loyalties

Nothing could be juster or more straightgoing than the declaration of Mr. Henry Weismann, president of the German-American Alliance, to the members of its executive board. "There can be no two loyalties," he insisted. "I know the German-Americans of this state are united with me in expressing the sentiment that we are for America first, last and all the time, and that the Germany we knew is but a memory."

Those are words to be pondered not only by citizens of German extraction, but by pacifists, Socialists and soap-boxers of various brands who are expressing themselves in a vein which indicates only too frequently that their loyalty is given elsewhere than to this country. There can be no two loyalties. He who is not for America is against America. Differences of opinion about policy and the administration of policy there are bound to be. These can be settled in due and orderly fashion according to the procedure established by the Constitution and the laws. The minority in this country has not been robbed of its privileges in any direction, and it will not be; but it is not the privilege of a minority in this or any other democracy to obstruct or scuttle the execution of the majority's policies as written in the laws, or to counsel or incite to rebellion against the law, either directly or by indirection.

Such conduct—and unfortunately there has been plenty of it—is not loyalty to America. It may be loyalty to Germany. It is gratifying to have a spokesman for the thousands on thousands of loyal citizens of German extraction express their loyalty for them in this uncompromising fashion. It renders more glaring the disloyalty of the anti-American newspapers, propagandists and spies parading behind the hyphen.

The Kaiser announces his Eastern armies are going "on with God." Very good, but who accompanies his Western armies on their frequent retreats?

An Englishman's Letter

(From The London Times)

To the Editor of The Times.

Sir: May a thrice-wounded officer who belongs to what is known as the "middle class," and who has to-day received the news of his elder son's death in action, and whose other son is invalided home from the front, ask if the government is going to tolerate the risk that our sacrifices should have been made in vain, in order that some who have done little else than talk may save their own coward skins by entering into negotiations with the enemy for an inconclusive peace, which would probably mean a recurrence of this world's tragedy within the next generation? In the name of "those who have gone West," let us at least protest, ere it is too late.

London, Aug. 11. J. D. W.

"Lafayette, Nous Voila!"

An Immortal Phrase Snatched From a General's Lips by History

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: If the one word spoken at the tomb of Lafayette which all Paris seized upon with pleasure and Americans could congratulate themselves upon has not before now reached the American public, a fact one learns with incredulity, it can only be because every American writer in Paris at the time took for granted that not a cabling correspondent would let so good a thing pass, and therefore individually forbore to repeat it in slower mail. By the same token, if we did not immediately all set to writing the obvious verse begining "Lafayette, here we are!" it was only because nobody could doubt the columns of American papers would be already filled with variants of it long before our own could cross a submarined ocean. We will give the poets now a month to repair the omission.

But in the interests of an historic truth let us also give credit where credit is due; it was not General Pershing, but Colonel Stanton, who said the fortunate word—the one word of the occasion.

GRACE ELLERY CHANNING.

New York, Sept. 3, 1917.

Stop the Mouth of Sedition

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I am another one of those millions of men who, like Mr. Quigg, have loving and only sons on the way to this war. That letter of Mr. Quigg (thank you for giving it such prominence) is certainly convincing and most refreshing to one's soul. Yet I notice in to-day's issue an emphatically discordant note by Arthur O. Lovejoy.

He characterizes any drastic action as "peculiarly gratuitous and a pernicious error of policy, and giving ground for suspicion that our cause cannot bear the test of open argument."

Then he protests that the majority of the American people are perfectly able to judge for themselves. That is, indeed, very evident, and to the extent of infinitely more than a mere majority. But what about that small but perverse, lying and criminal residue who do not wish to submit to either majority or reason, and whose purpose is not any honorable endeavor to honestly enlighten anybody, but rather to deceive those that are gullible and persuade them to deeds of treason solely for the benefit of the enemy?

Sinister as the doings of these people are, we do not object to tolerating them within certain reasonable bounds and squarely in the open in time of peace. But the present is a time of very serious world war, which is a very different matter, and we are all too busy and too serious-minded—or ought to be so—to be in a mood to trifle, or to be everlastingly discussing with hopeless fanatics, or allowing them to go unanswered, as they would much prefer. For they wish for nothing but the chance to propagate delusion and sheer fanaticism, the logical result of which is the breeding of such fiends as Charles Guiteau, Czolgosz and the like, with the addition of any deeds of frightfulness they can possibly perpetrate.

I would surely add my voice and say, "Stop the mouth of sedition, even with bullets, if it must be so." MAURICE C. ROBERTS.

New York, Sept. 4, 1917.

The P[illegible] Only Force

To the Editor of [illegible]ribune.

Sir: Mr. Tryon wishes to impress us with the fact "that the future of democracy in this country has much more to hope from the persons who are endeavoring to maintain its constitutional guarantees than from those who are making use of force to overthrow them." "Those" evidently refers to "patriots' of the Roosevelt-Moffett brand." We hope this needs no comment. As for making use of force, the only real force being used is the very considerable one of public opinion, which his friends, the pacifists, are attempting to turn to their own ends.

Indeed, Mr. Tryon, far from upholding their idealistic views, suspects his pacifist friends "of caring more for the 'scrap' which an expression of their principles was likely to get them into than for the principles themselves." So the friend pacifists are inciting anti-draft riots, labor disturbances and class warfare, and are giving very material aid and comfort to Germany, all for the sake of a personal "scrap"! Quite original, but it would be vastly simpler to enlist.

If Mr. Tryon is right in his suspicion, all pacifists might be furnished cosey little rooms in the public homes for the feeble-minded, and the country be rid of a serious pest.

ERIC GWYN.

Tolland, Mass., Sept. 3, 1917.

The Tribune and the News

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: May I express appreciation of the fact that regardless of your general policy and editorial preferences you print the news?

Again and again I fail to find in "The Times" and "Sun" items of democratic activity equally uncongenial to the editors of the three papers, but none the less reported faithfully in The Tribune. The latest example is the absence from "The Times" and the presence in The Tribune of the resolution adopted yesterday in Chicago by the People's Council for Democracy and Peace. I thank you also for printing some of the planks of their constitution, and I cannot help wondering if the failure of a paper to print them may not be due to a misgiving lest any balanced person reading them should wonder what all the row is about and why on the whole principles of the People's Council should not be indorsed.

In fact, they seem to be more in accord than their critics with the President of the United States. And, again, I wonder why the officials attempting to suppress such efforts should not have been equally minded to suppress the President's answer to the Pope.

JULIA ELLSWORTH FORD.

Easthampton, N. Y., Sept. 3, 1917.

Ship Them Back!

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Although not one of the "five million of fathers" named by Lemuel Ely Quigg in Saturday's Tribune, but merely a mother—and of daughters, at that—I am fired with a desire to express my great admiration for his wonderful letter, and also for that of Charles R. Trowbridge in The Tribune to-day. Both of these letters suit me exactly, and already I have insisted on reading them to pacifist friends, trying to bring them to these points of view.

Especially all must indorse what Mr. Trowbridge writes concerning the right of free speech, which is so shamefully abused by those who have flocked to this country to escape the oppression of their own. No sooner do they establish themselves here than they in turn wish to put the thumbscrews on those in authority who have given them the liberty they abuse and the chance for becoming loyal citizens which they have repudiated.

Why not ship them—together with plotting Americans—on the ocean, to feed the submarines, unless they are lucky enough to get across to their divine friend, the Kaiser?

GEORGIANA P. CHEESMAN.

New York, Sept. 4, 1917.

Eyewash: a British Camouflage

An Institution Closely Resembling Old-Fashioned American Window Dressing and Likely to Invade Any Bureaucracy

(From The Saturday Review)

Who first invented the term, and when, we do not know. From its expressiveness one fears an American origin, but hopes that after all the British army (which at least knows a good neologism when it sees one) can claim its parentage. It was the army that gave us "strafe" and "blighty" and "napoo" and "wind-up" and "skrimshanker" and "swinging the lead," and many another indispensable word or phrase, and so we may not be far wrong in giving the army credit for "eyewash." But whether the word is or is not of military origin, it is fairly safe to aver that the thing it connotes has its root in the army. It might perhaps be explained—obscura per obscuriora—as a camouflage intended to conceal inward defects by outer display. But accurate definition is not possible, since "eyewash" assumes so many and so diverse shapes that only by experience can one appreciate the true inwardness of the term and thereby realize its danger.

In Its Crude Beginnings

The significance of "eyewash" in its crudest form was revealed to us in the early days of the war. A certain very famous general was to inspect a battalion of cyclists. Before his arrival the commanding officer went down the ranks and ordered all the men who wore spectacles or pince-nez to remove them. "I don't want the general to imagine that the battalion is made up of blind men," he explained. A laudable sentiment, perhaps, but it was his business to let the general know all that was to be known about the battalion. A few weeks later that same general inspected the same battalion. There was a little party of men, some fifteen to twenty, whose bicycles were undergoing repairs at the time, and who therefore paraded on foot. "Why are these men dismounted?" asked the general. The reply came trippingly from the colonel's tongue: "They are a new draft, sir. They arrived only this week and have not yet been issued with bicycles." It was a fib, and a fairly obvious fib, for one at least of the men was a lance-coporal with a conspicuous stripe on his sleeve. But the general accepted the explanation readily enough. It seems to be one of the rules of the "eyewash" game that a senior officer believes all that he is told. This general was a past master in the game; so expert, in fact, that not many months later he was relieved of an important command owing to a disastrous failure. It was pleaded for him that he was "let down" by his subordinates. That may be true, but a commander who encourages his juniors to "eyewash" him will always be "let down," just as Sir Beauchamp Duff was "let down" at a later date.

A Gallant Colonel

There is a colonel in England to-day who, when his battalion goes for a route march, accompanies them mounted. That is quite right and proper; company commanders and senior officers are entitled to a mount. But this colonel always sends a cyclist orderly ahead of the battalion to scout for the brigadier or an officer of the staff, on whose approach being reported to him the colonel dismounts and gives his horse to a man to lead. The gallant fellow acquires merit thus in the general's eyes, and is complimented on sharing the burdens of his men. This manifestation of "eyewash" is not good for the morale of the battalion, and that commanding officer is by no means popular with his men.

It is different in France. Instances of eyewash (it is time to dispense with the inverted commas) are not easy to find there. Possibly that is because the inefficient commanders were drastically weeded out at an early stage. They were mostly consigned to "ccoshier" positions with training battalions at home. But the practice is not confined to our home forces. Nor is it confined to the army. The report of the Mesopotamia Commission reveals eyewash in its extremest and most shameless manifestations. Junior officers were not only expected to report that everything was for the best in the best of all possible worlds, but, as in the wellnigh incredible case of Colonel Carter, they were bullied, threatened and boycotted because they did not conform to the rules of the game. And General Cowper, after himself conforming to the rules, found himself denounced as "petulant and querulous," and in danger of losing his employment, when he subsequently failed to furnish his C.-in-C. with the comforting reports that were desired. In the most emphatic and unmistakable terms the policy of eyewash was insisted upon from the very highest quarters.

Bureaucratic Virus

It is far too much to expect that the Mesopotamia Blue Book has freed the army and the government departments of the eyewash virus. As well expect Russia's non-stop revolution to have cleared graft out of Russia or infused a sudden political sense into the unlettered moujik. Wherever you have an unprogressive bureaucracy there you will have the rosy spectacled policy that avoids trouble from higher authority and conceals departmental shortcomings. The army is a vastly ramified organization of inter-dependent bureaucracies; the government departments, with their irremovable stagnant officials, are little self-sufficing bureaucracies. The virus infects both.

When Mr. Asquith was assured by his complaisant officials, in the spring of 1915, that the output of munitions was satisfactory and adequate to our needs, he was supplied with pernicious eyewash. He was given the sort of information that would be most acceptable, because for the officials that was the line of least resistance. To abolish such a practice a constant draft of vigilant and competent criticism is required. Such criticism, under present conditions, is only forthcoming by haphazard. It is either provided by watchful "outsiders," who cannot, in the nature of things, be equipped with all the facts; or else it is on rare occasions supplied by an exceptionally active and fearless minister, who finds his efforts at reform encumbered by the Mollusk-like opposition of his reactionary bureaucrats. But there is no permenant check to the development of that departmental beri-beri which seems invariably to infect the government official, breeding tendencies to red-tapery, eyewash and lethargy. The breeziest and most energetic of ministers has not enough hours in his day to attend at the same time to his administrative duties and to his herculean task of internal reform.

Whether in the army or in the civil service the principle of eyewash remains the same. "Don't worry your superiors with the skeleton in your cupboard. Life will be smoother for every one if the cupboard is kept closed, with a pretty curtain in front of it. Besides, with luck, the skeleton will never be brought to light in your time."

Weeding Yet To Be Done

The type of official we require in positions of responsibility is the man who will see for himself, and not allow his subordinates to fob him off with specious display. Such a man would not be popular, perhaps, but he would be efficient. Is he the type of man we have to-day in responsible posts? In the expeditionary force, yes; for three years of hard campaigning have weeded out the showy incapables. But in the civil service the permanent unimaginativeness of the permanently imbedded civil servant still, probably, holds sway. And here, above all, we shall in the near future need the application of the broom—or, rather, the vacuum cleaner—which has, in the army, replaced antiquated and ineffective professors of eyewash by men who do things and can get things done. Before we embark on reconstruction let us, in Heaven's name, reconstruct our reconstructors.

The German Mind

Chance of Revolution or Repentance Practically Nil

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: It is to be feared that the premise which our President has assumed in his answer to Pope Benedict is not well taken. That premise claims that there is an essential difference in opinion between the German autocratic power and that of the people generally, as we would consider the people in our own country. With centuries of subservience by the mass of the central portions comprising the bulk of the truly German people to authorized and autocratic power, there is little left now of a determination of mind to oppose anything in the way of opposition to the humdrum, continuous everyday state of affairs. Should opposition be shown it would be, and has been, put down as effectively as was Carl Schurz's attempt, with that of others, in 1848.

What, then, can be expected of a nation so thoroughly opposed as is the German people to any change? There is little hope for it. All Germany went into the war with enthusiasm and with an absolute expectation of a rapid success. The hope of that success still obtains in the bulk of the people.

Changing now gradually from big accomplishments in the military line to a feeling that they have got a lot, but not all they want to get, and then with a kind of growing fear that they may not be so successful after all, and then, when food commences to pinch and they don't seem to get much ahead—what then? They are threatened with foreign foes! The whole world seems to be against them. These stupid Englishmen don't know when to quit. Even America will aid them! But they will conquer! Their Kaiser has said that they must have the will to conquer, and so they will go on, repulsing all their enemies and, trusting to God and their Hindenburg, they will conquer!

What can be thought of a public who reasons like that? The bulk do. Why so? Because for years they have been dominated, like all Central European nations, by autocratic power. Can they rebel? No. It is not in their nature to even attempt it. What then? No outbreak similar to Russia, no nothing. The whole population now believes itself, or will soon believe itself, an object of persecution by the Allied powers. What will be the effect? Like the Southern Confederacy in 1865, they will fight to the end.

The German character is that of stolidity. It is hard to change it. Yet the diplomats and junkers are subtle. How can we arrange it? How can we as Americans make the bulk of Germans see our point of view and theirs, too? Possibly by compromise. Probably by arms. President Wilson may effect the result by words, but for us, now getting in deeper than any one could have imagined, let us press forward to the prize of the high calling of democracy for the world, and join wholeheartedly with our allies to achieve that noble outcome.

There is no turning backward now! We must get them or they will get us!

LEWIS NICKERSON.

Attleboro, Mass., Sept. 4, 1917.

Esperanto in France

An Open Sesame to Firesides of the Green-Buttoned

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Will you kindly allow me to add a few lines to the timely suggestion of Mr. James McKirdy, that appeared in to-day's Tribune, with reference to the help which our soldiers might derive from studying Esperanto on their way to France?

I wish to tell the soldiers who are going to fight side by side with the brave Frenchmen to end this war with a peace that should not turn out to be a mere truce, but a peace that will make war in the future impossible, a peace that the conquered nations would welcome as fervently as the conquerors, that the French government, keenly alive to the great advantages offered by the auxiliary international language Esperanto, has already long ago made extensive use of it in its various activities.

The Ministry of War, for instance, as I have gleaned from the French Esperanto paper, "France Esperanto," some time ago published as an initial instalment 20,000 Red Cross manuals in Esperanto. For further particulars the soldiers should on landing in France write to 51 Rue de Clichy, Paris, 9e., which is the headquarters of a very important organization, known as "Un Comité d'Amis de l'Esperanto," whose membership list could readily pass for "Who Is Who in France," containing as it does not only some of the best known names of the French nobility, but the names of the greatest lights of the French Academy, presidents of universities, some of France's best known publicists and littérateurs. For, while Esperanto was born in Russian Poland and went to school, so to say, in Germany, it attained its full stature in France, and it was in Paris where, before the war, the best known Esperanto periodicals were published; and the secretary of the Scienca Asocio, which also published the monthly "Scienca Gazeto," is no less a person than Rollet de l'Isle, the chief engineer of the French navy.

Mr. McKirdy, whom I do not have the honor to know, has by no means exaggerated the ease with which Esperanto can be acquired. At the end of six months from the time that I learned the Esperanto A B C, I, at the request of the editor of "Esperanto," the official journal of the Universala Esperanto Asocio, having its headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland, wrote quite a long article about the life in New York (the editor not being aware how recent a convert to Esperanto I then was), and to my own surprise, my article was published without the change of a comma.

I shall willingly send a "key" to Esperanto to any one who will inclose a two-cent stamp.

I ought to add that, apart from its use during the war, the Esperantist, no matter in what part of the world he finds himself, will find that his green five-pointed button gives him an open sesame to the fireside of any Esperanto family, at whose door he would otherwise not dare to knock.

JOSEPH SILVERNIK,

New York Delegate of the Universal Esperanto Association.

New York, Aug. 31, 1917.

Servants in Co-operation

Here Is One Housekeeper Who Won Help, Not Hindrance

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: From the gloom of Mrs. H. T. S.'s letter to The Tribune this morning there comes to me a gleam of glorious sunshine, because personally my own experience has been so different.

Systematically I have talked with my maids, have cut out particular articles for them to read. I have endeavored to show them the way by curtailing my own personal expenses. The food conservation articles have been brought practically to their attention.

"Here a little, there a little, line upon line, precept upon precept." When Liberty bonds were to be put on the market I took them to see and hear a beautiful and noble woman who stood on the platform of our Jersey City Women's Club, side by side with Mr. McCarter, from Newark, and the result was as I had anticipated.

When they heard the beautiful Mrs. August Belmont telling in her inimitable manner the why and wherefore of these Liberty bonds, these maids were glad to buy a bond, each one of them. And I am proud to add they had already liberally contributed to the Red Cross campaign, besides being yearly members of that wonderful organization.

The brother of one of my maids is on one of our United States cruisers, and I, who have no sons to send, feel a glow of pride when his sister comes and brings me this message: "I have another letter from Paddy," and a thrill goes through me as I think of that brave, handsome Irish lad, only three years in America, over there, "somewhere on the high seas," fighting for me and mine, and I am not at all ashamed of the tears that fill my eyes when I think of him and the thousands like him who are giving their best for us who may not go. When I urge my maids to do these patriotic things I do not feel ashamed that I cannot vote, nor do I say (as I have heard several prominent suffragists) that "I have no country." I have a country, and I do not want the vote, but I mean to do my very best for my beloved country, and I know she will bring peace to all the world when we have such men as Paddy and such maids to help us fight our great battle for democracy.

MRS. ALVONI R. ALLEN.

Jersey City, N. J., Sept. 4, 1917.

"Free Speech" and Force

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The experience of Mr. Henry T. Price as described by him in your issue of to-day's date, while he was present at a meeting of "the so-called Friends of Irish Freedom," recalls to my memory an occasion several months ago when I also happened to be present at one of these gatherings.

I want to congratulate Mr. Price, however, as the treatment accorded to him was really mild in comparison to what happened to two men in the short half hour that I was there. I came in time to hear "the silver-tongued orator of Broadway" introduced, who, after exhausting himself on his anti-British theme in the usual vituperative manner, began attacking the Administration, President Wilson and "the English owned and subsidized newspapers of New York City."

The President was described as taking his orders from England, and his British sympathies were said to be due to the training he received from his Scotch parents. To give the audience some idea of what this training might have been, President Wilson's father was characterized as being a Scotch minister who came to this country after having preached in the "drunken slums of Glasgow."

At this juncture a man in the audience called out: "Cut that out!" That is all. He was immediately set upon by about a dozen "Irish friends," and a sharp order came from the speaker to "Throw him out." He was thrown—to that I can testify, for I heard his skull crash against the sidewalk. Another man who protested against this violence was called a spy from the British Embassy, and he made his escape only after he, too, was thrown, and his head struck the plate glass window of a store on the north side of the street. The newspaper that came in for most of the criticism that night was "The World," and Mr. Pulitzer was accused of being in the pay of the British government, and "The New York Times" as being controlled by Lord Northcliffe, of "The London Times."

No policeman was present, and these libelous statements against the President, our institutions and newspapers were hurled at Americans from a street corner in the Empire City by an alien mob of speakers, and under the guise of free speech brutal force was used with impunity to enforce their treasonable utterances. L. H. K.

New York, Sept. 3, 1917.

More Four-Minute Men Wanted

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: The Four-Minute Men are in need of recruits, so I am taking the liberty of addressing this letter to you, with the request that you publish it in your paper.

The Four-Minute Men are an organization operating under direct authority from Washington, whose function it is to place speakers in the motion picture theatres to talk for four minutes on subjects of national importance. The material for the speeches is prepared in bulletin form at the headquarters in Washington from data furnished by the departments having control of the topics spoken on. Speeches have already been made on "Liberty Loan," "Red Cross," "Food Conservation," "Why We Are at War," etc. The Four-Minute Men have branches in forty states, with about five thousand speakers enrolled, and are enjoying the hearty and patriotic coöperation of the members of the motion picture industry.

Any man who is anxious to do something at this time can have the opportunity by enrolling as a Four-Minute Man and speaking any number of nights a week convenient to him to motion picture theatre audiences, telling them what the government wants them to know. We need such men badly, and hope that any one interested will please communicate with the Four-Minute Men, 53 East Forty-fourth Street; 'phone Murray Hill 2980.

JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS,
Chairman New York State.

New York, Sept. 4, 1917.

Money in Horses

(From The Portland Oregonian)

Farmers should every year reap a large harvest of dollars through the sale of work horses. Enough attention is not given to this profitable branch of farming in this part of the country. Farmers, one and all, will admit that it pays big to raise a pair of colts until they are four years old, break them and put them in prime condition and sell them at five years old for anywhere from $400 to $600. Even at an average price of $500 there is money in the business.

Yet few farmers take advantage of their opportunities, even though they have good brood mares which they use for work animals. If they breed them at all they are more than likely to breed to inferior grade or scrub stallions because they can thereby save a few dollars. They save maybe $10 in fees and raise an animal worth $100 when by spending $10 or $15 additional the animal would have been worth $150 or more—with the cost of raising just the same.